RECEIVED

JAN 1 4 2000

EIS002087

MR. ARNOLD: I need to — I don't know how to do this. Because there was — I just found an error in one of my previous things that I entered in. Is it acceptable to correct it for purposes of clarification?

- Richard Arnold, spokesperson for the Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations. Previously I indicated under appendix G 12-13 states that copies of DEIS was sent to all governors and states, but not to tribes within those states except by request. That statement actually is somewhat true. However, reading, examining the section in the EIS, it states here that Native American groups, and I think that that should probably be clarified to say Native American tribes or any tribes or whatever, because groups can mean organizations or what have you. So I would recommend that that change be indicated in there. And that's on actually D-1, in the very introduction.
- Secondly, on page D-12 it identifies all the different Native American groups. And for the Las Vegas Indians, it has the title for Mr. Jesse Lee, his organization -- chairperson, was the official title. His particular position is Chairman of the Board. So I would recommend that that be changed and this be consistent with all the other accurate titles that are placed there for everyone else.
- And, lastly, under on page J-110, environmental justice, section J.3.6.4, it talks in this section, and if could quote it, it says, "In addition to the nearly random nature of accidents that would involve the transportation of materials and people, the probability of such an accident would be small in any location, minimizing the risk at a specific location. Furthermore, because the potential accidents would be nearly random, impacts to minorities in low income populations and to Native Americans along the routes in Nevada, it would be unlikely to be disproportionately high and adverse."

And with that particular statement, we would then disagree with that, because if there was an accident near a reservation, clearly being an Indian population there, we believe that would be higher and more disproportionate. I would also -- with that close proximity due to the subsistence patterns of Native Americans that that, again, would be a disproportionately high something to the Indian people, whatever the word is. So with that -- I'm going brain dead right now.

That concludes my remarks. Thank you.